



**SCOTTSDALE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
KIVA - CITY HALL
3939 N. DRINKWATER BOULEVARD
JULY 20, 2006
APPROVED**

PRESENT: Betty Drake, Councilman
Jeremy A. Jones, Vice Chairman
Steve Steinberg, Commissioner
Michael Edwards, Design Member
Michael D'Andrea, Development Member
David Brantner, Development Member
Michael Schmitt, Design Member

STAFF: Lusia Galav
Don Hadder
Mac Cummins
Dan Symer
Tim Curtis
Kim Chafin

CALL TO ORDER

The study session of the Scottsdale Development Review Board was called to order by Councilwoman Drake at 1:02 p.m.

OPENING STATEMENT

Councilwoman Drake read the opening statement that describes the role of the Development Review Board and the procedures used in conducting this meeting.

ROLL CALL

A formal roll call was conducted confirming members present as stated above.

MINUTES APPROVAL

1. July 13, 2006 Development Review Board Study Session Minutes
2. July 13, 2006 Development Review Board Regular Meeting Minutes

VICE-CHAIRMAN JONES MOVED TO APPROVE THE JULY 13, 2006 MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD, INCLUDING THE STUDY SESSION. SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER SCHMITT, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

CONSENT AGENDA

3. 87-DR-2004#5 Bank of America @ Hayden Peak Crossing Pad B
4. 87-DR-2004#6 Hayden Peak Crossing Pad C
5. 22-PP-2005/
113-DR-2005 Sereno Canyon
6. 25-PP-2005 Carmichael Court
8. 32-DR-2006 Hayden Array
10. 54-DR-2006 Fire Station 602
11. 55-DR-2006 Saguaro High School

VICE-CHAIRMAN JONES MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF CASES 87-DR-2004#5, 87-DR-2004#6, 22-PP-2005, 113-DR-2005, 25-PP-2005, 32-DR-2006, 54-DR-2006, AND 55-DR-2006. SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER D'ANDREA, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

7. 91-DR-2005 SEC Scottsdale & Lone Mountain

BOARD MEMBER D'ANDREA MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 91-DR-2005 WITH THE AMENDED STIPULATIONS. SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER SCHMITT, THE MOTION CARRIED BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0). COUNCILWOMAN DRAKE WAS RECUSED.

REGULAR AGENDA

9. 37-DR-2006 Scottsdale Auto Salon

Mr. Hadder addressed the Board. Highlights of his presentation included an aerial photograph of the area and site plan. He reviewed difficulties of the site including the power line corridor located to the southwest side of the property and a wash that runs along the east side of the site.

Board Member Schmitt expressed concern about the extensive use of glass on the northwest facing circular element of the building. Mike Leary, owner, explained that the solar issue would be handled by adding perforated metal screens as window coverings;

the power line corridor prevents use of an overhang or awning on that side of the building. Mr. Leary noted that a coffee shop would be located in the circular portion of the building. Board Member Schmitt commented that the glass located high on the building would not provide any benefit; a better option would be using less glass or the use of fins in order to break up the sunlight.

Board Member Schmitt opined that the elevations were too industrial for a neighborhood gathering place. He suggested that adding some color to the palette, which currently consists of three shades of brown, would benefit the project.

Board Member Schmitt inquired why the two elevations facing the street are uninteresting and the interesting elevation faced the RV storage center and the power lines. Mr. Leary explained there had been concern by the condominium association on 94th Street about windows and operational features facing their property, which affected the configuration of the building. Other constraints included the MEDCAP color constraints from Horseman's Park as well as the ESL which is located to the east of the power line. Board Member Schmitt opined that the color and design constraints were guidelines, not imperative statements.

In response to a question by Board Member Schmitt regarding the shape of the roof element at the northwest corner, John Riddell, architect, explained the roof was designed to give a different look to the otherwise rounded corner of the building. Mr. Riddell further explained reasons for using the perforated metal on the windows, including the glass on the second level which would house the corporate offices. Board Member Schmitt opined that there would be more interesting and innovative ways to handle the problems.

Vice-Chairman Jones opined there was inconsistency in the use of a decorative overhang when it had been stated that an overhang or sunshade protecting could not be used on the rounded corner. He suggested that effective shading could be created by either extending the vertical elements or recessing the windows in order to achieve horizontal shade as the sun comes around in the afternoon.

Vice-Chairman Jones suggested considering reversing the building, placing the service areas on the inside of the shopping center in order to allow the areas that would benefit from the view to face the McDowell Mountains. He noted that he would like to see some of the details resolved before approving the application.

In response to a request by Board Member D'Andrea, Mr. Riddell reviewed the site plan and how a vehicle would progress through the site. Mr. Riddell explained if the system was flipped as proposed by Vice-Chairman Jones people walking to the coffee shop would have to cross through the vehicular circulation.

Mr. Leary explained that a study had discovered that if the project were flipped, they would be trading one set of problems for another.

Referencing another local carwash, Board Member D'Andrea pointed out potential traffic flow problems if a Bell Road entrance is used. He stated that it would be helpful if the Applicant were to flip the site so that the Board could see the pro's and con's in each

version. Mr. Leary argued that striping and signing would be used to lead vehicles through the site entering off of Bell Road.

Councilwoman Drake opined that either version would be acceptable in terms of the circulation once customers were familiar with the process. She opined that the project should be reversed in order to take advantage of the mountain views.

BOARD MEMBER SCHMITT MOVED TO CONTINUE CASE 37-DR-2006 TO GIVE THE APPLICANT AN OPPORTUNITY TO REVIEW THE ELEVATIONS AND WHAT CAN BE DONE TO IMPROVE THE PROJECT AS WELL AS TO REVIEW THE SITE PLAN AND RETURN TO THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD WITH A GRAPHIC EXPLANATION OF THE BENEFIT OF THE CURRENT DESIGN. VICE-CHAIRMAN JONES SECONDED THE MOTION.

Mr. Leary argued that the circulation issues were discussed three or four years ago during the use permit process. Councilwoman Drake stated the maker of the motion made it clear that he wanted documentation to be brought back to the Board depicting reasons why the alternate plan would not work.

Commissioner Steinberg remarked about the difficulty of the site, noting the car wash was one of the nicest he had seen in a long time in the heavily industrial area.

THE MOTION CARRIED BY A VOTE OF FIVE (5) TO TWO (2). COMMISSIONER STEINBERG AND BOARD MEMBER BRANTNER DISSENTED.

12. 110-DR-2005 The 4020 Building

Mr. Cummins addressed the Board. Highlights of his presentation included an aerial photo, a site plan, and the urban design objectives. He described the relation of the building in relation to the Old Town area which is generally characterized by western theme structures and tourist service land uses. Mr. Cummins reviewed the four main design objectives of the Old Town area, one of which is to maintain the frontier town western image of Old Town and second to reinforce the image with carefully placed landscaping. Because the project is not located within Old Town, it is not necessary for the building to fit every design guideline, however it should not conflict with any of the standards.

Presenting a video depiction, Mr. Cummins reviewed the architectural style of surrounding structures and proposed designs relationship to them. He reviewed the original elevations and the changes that had been made with the final submittal. Staff was looking at what would be the most appropriate transition out of Old Town at that corner. Mr. Cummins noted that the staff analysis and information was included in the Board packets and recommended continuance to a date uncertain, noting a revised application could possibly be prepared by the next meeting. Draft stipulations were included for Board consideration which would need to be included if the application is approved.

Board Member Brantner opined that although the City would like to keep the western feel in Old Town the area needs to mature and this building would be a good start.

in response to a question by Board Member D'Andrea, Mr. Cummins confirmed that the reason a continuance was recommended was because staff felt the building did not transition out of Old Town as well as it could.

Mr. Peter Blied presented a packet depicting a pictorial history of the progress of the project. He encouraged the Board Members to look at the first page which was a photo of the existing building and compare it to the last page which was the current proposal.

In response to a question by Commissioner Steinberg, Mr. Blied confirmed that the first version submitted in December met with opposition from the community as well as code deficiencies; input was taken from neighbors and changes were incorporated to create the current submittal.

Commissioner Steinberg commented the windows seemed flush with the exterior materials with no sun shading, compared to the original version which had deep recesses.

In response to an inquiry by Board Member Brantner regarding pedestrian overhangs, Mr. Blied explained that a trellis was proposed over the entryway glass on both the Scottsdale and First Avenue side, in addition to the existing arcade on the southeastern corner of the building.

In response to a question by Board Member Edwards, Mr. Blied clarified that the computer simulation did not depict the glass and color scheme accurately; the photo simulation and materials board were more accurate. The trellis latticework was proposed to be made out of a trux material in order to pick up the wood look while providing a long-lasting, durable material.

Board Member D'Andrea pointed out that the material that was actually a hearty plank material appeared to be brick in the final rendering, which will make it fit less with the surrounding area.

Councilwoman Drake opened public testimony.

Darlene Peterson addressed the Board noting opposition of the current proposed design because it does not fit with the surrounding area.

Mr. Carroll Huntress, owner of the Sugar Bowl restaurant, spoke in opposition of the current proposed design. He would like to see realistic western architecture used.

Marilyn Atkinson expressed opposition to the design because the architecture design should respect the history of the Old Town area.

Tom Frenkel, 6716 East Montecito, spoke in favor of the design.

Councilwoman Drake read two non-speaking comment cards into the record. Patty Badenoch opined the design did not lend itself to maintaining the western integrity of Old Town and inquired whether the LEED program had been referenced. Joanne Handley believed the design was too contemporary for the area.

in response to an inquiry by Commissioner Steinberg, staff confirmed that there was no historic overlay of the area that would control the architecture. Commissioner Steinberg opined that cities do not remain the same and the diversity that is being proposed and the live/work environment would be vital to the success of Downtown. He was in support of the application.

Vice-Chairman Jones remarked that a decision needed to be made whether the building was a continuation, an abrupt change, or a transition from Old Town; part of the problem is defining what "western" should be. He noted problems arise when emulating existing buildings because many times the new building diminishes the impact of what already exists. He opined the appropriate design would be transitional and form a buffer. Vice-Chairman Jones commented that overall the submittal would work well in the area.

Board Member Schmitt agreed that the building should be transitional. He opined that the design fit into the context of what had been discussed as desirable following the tour of Downtown taken by the Development Review Board several months ago. He expressed disappointment in the use of materials, noting he would prefer to see brick used. Board Member Schmitt will support the application.

Councilwoman Drake remarked that the proposal would not be appropriate. This was a splendid opportunity for a building with historical character; it should be modeled after the Legacy Gallery, not SkySong. The current proposal is not consistent with the area and would not create a viable transition. Councilwoman Drake was not in favor of supporting a motion for approval.

COMMISSIONER STEINBERG MOVED TO APPROVE 110-DR-2005 WITH THE STIPULATIONS INCLUDED BY STAFF AS WELL AS A STIPULATION REQUIRING ALTERNATE EXTERIOR MATERIALS BE BROUGHT BACK TO STUDY SESSION FOR REVIEW. SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER BRANTNER, THE MOTION CARRIED BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ONE (1). COUNCILWOMAN DRAKE DISSENTED.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, Councilwoman Drake moved for adjournment at 2:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
AV-Tronics, Inc